

18 February 1963

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Intelligence)

SUBJECT : State Department Comments on "Franco-Soviet Discussions and Negotiations", 8 February 1963

REFERENCE : Memorandum from Roger Hilsman to DCI, 11 February 1963

1. The unhappiness expressed by INR in subject memorandum presumably resulted from the hasty manner in which the CIA Memorandum, Franco-Soviet Discussions and Negotiations, published on 8 February 1963 for the NSC, was prepared and disseminated. The State Department representative, Mr. Anton De Porte, who participated in the consultative meetings on the draft version of the memorandum, indicated to me by phone immediately following final publication of the CIA Memorandum that he would lodge a formal protest through channels over what he considered CIA's failure to fulfill its coordinating responsibility. De Porte was annoyed that after the representatives of State and DIA had agreed in a long meeting on the afternoon of 8 February on revisions to a much battered original draft, CIA had failed to give the representatives an opportunity to review a "cleaned up" version of the text before final publication. Mr. De Porte also said that if he had been given the opportunity to review the cleaned up version of the draft he could have prevented the inclusion of items which he felt were questionable. The referenced INR memorandum details the points which he felt were dubious.

2. It is true that at the conclusion of the consultation meetings with the State and DIA representatives the CIA personnel involved undertook to make available "clean copies" of the revised draft before final publication. At that point, however, there were no differences outstanding in terms of approach

or--as far as anyone knew--in terms of text. Certain "housekeeping details" were left in the hands of the CIA personnel: (1) The preparation of a summary of the whole piece, and (2) the consolidation of all the sources from which the text was drawn into an annex. These tasks were completed during the evening of 8 February and the whole package presented for the DD/I's approval the following morning. Some delays were encountered as various versions of the summary were tried and abandoned during the course of the morning. No effort was made to dispatch the "cleaned-up" version of the text to the State and DIA representatives until final approval of the summary was obtained, because it was assumed that this was what the representatives would be principally concerned with seeing as it was the only part of the overall paper to which they had not been exposed.

3. As the morning wore on it became evident that the DD/I approval of the summary and final deadline for publication of the paper would coincide. This in fact did happen and at noon when all the pieces finally fell together, it seemed pointless to send State and DIA coordination copies since it was strongly felt that publication should not be delayed.

4. I attach a comment on the specific point in the INR memorandum directed at Paragraph 7 of Annex A of the final CIA Memorandum.

25X1A

Chief, Western Area
Current Intelligence

Attachment: a/s

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee

1 - AD/CI

25X1A

1 - SA/CI

25X1A

1 - SSBA

2 - CA/WE

OCI/CD/WE: :yd/ -2-

7424(18 Feb 63)

Re: State Department objection to source cited for
Paragraph 7, Annex A to CIA Memorandum on Franco-
Soviet Discussions and Negotiations

Mr. De Porte raised no objection to the substance of Paragraph 7, Annex A on 7 February when he participated in a panel which discussed the draft from which that paragraph is repeated verbatim. He accepted the conclusions of the draft, but insisted on expanding the list of reports it cited to include items which had been eliminated from the draft distributed for State-DIA consideration because they did not alter the conclusion. In view of the length of the expanded list of citations, it had been agreed to put them in an annex, which implied a need to specify sources. The DD/P had refused to disseminate either [REDACTED]

25X1A

[REDACTED] Our only copy of the latter had been given to [REDACTED] on 6 February. [REDACTED] was considered a satisfactory alternative source because it gave the gist of the newspaper article referred to, and because it substantiated the veracity of the [REDACTED] and the reliability of his sources. The fact that [REDACTED] who is a journalist is hardly a state secret.

25X1A

25X1X